

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached 4 sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 2 and 3. Duplicate Figures 1 and 4 have been deleted from the second sheet. These sheets, which include Figures 1 through 5, replace the previously presented sheets including Figures 1 through 5. Figures 2 and 3 have been placed on the second sheet. Duplicate Figures 1 and 4 have been deleted from the second sheet. The proposed amended drawing sheets are attached.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Four proposed replacement sheets.

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:**

Claims 1, 7, 9, 12 and 18 have been amended. The drawings have been amended. Claims 1 through 18 remain in the application. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone conference on December 9, 2005 to discuss the present application.

The drawings were objected to because of informalities. The Applicant has taken the Examiner's suggestion and deleted the identical Figures 1 and 4 on the second sheet, and moved Figures 2 and 3 on the second sheet to the same sheet for clarity of the invention. Therefore, four proposed drawing sheets are attached, including Figures 1 through 5 as filed in the original application. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings overcome the objection because of informalities and it is respectfully requested that the objection be removed.

Claims 1, 5-9, 11 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Helms, Sr., 5,083,375. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

U.S. Patent No. 5,083,375 to Helms, Sr., discloses a drywall cutting device.

In contradistinction, claim 1, as amended, claims a cutting tool for sheet material comprising an elongate guide member having a longitudinal guide channel formed therein. The cutting tool also comprises a support arm attached to the guide member. The cutting tool has a body piece with a handle and a cutting assembly wherein the body piece being slideable completely across the guide member and selectively securable along a linear portion of the support arm.

Helms, Sr., does not disclose, teach, suggest or anticipate the present invention of claim 1, as amended. Specifically, Helms, Sr., does not disclose a cutting tool for sheet material having a body piece with a handle and a cutting assembly, wherein the body piece being slideable completely across a guide member and selectively securable along the linear portion of

the support arm. Furthermore, Helms, Sr., does not disclose a support arm attached to a guide member wherein the support arm includes a substantially U-shaped portion extending in a plane intersecting and transverse to an orientation of the guide member and a substantially linear portion extending across the guide member. Nowhere does Helms, Sr., disclose, teach, or even suggest any limitations as described above. The slide track 12 of the '375 reference is the only guide member disclosed in the Helms, Sr., reference. The body piece 44, as defined by the Examiner, is not capable of being slideable completely across the guide member 12 as disclosed, taught or suggested in the '375 patent. The cutting means would not allow for body piece 44 to be slideable completely across the guide member 12 as shown in the '375 reference. Furthermore, the Helms, Sr., '375 reference nowhere discloses a support arm including a U-shaped portion extending in a plane intersecting and transverse to an orientation of the guide member and a substantial linear portion extending across the guide member. The '375 reference only discloses multiple support arms with relation to the guide member 44. Therefore, as these limitations claimed by Applicant in claim 1, as amended, are not disclosed, taught or suggested in Helms, Sr., the '375 reference cannot be used as a §102 or §103 reference against Applicant's claims as amended. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that Helms, Sr., '375 fails to disclose all of the limitations claimed by Applicant in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom, overcome the rejection under 35 USC §102(b) and are allowable over this rejection.

Independent claims 7, 9, 12 and 18 were amended in a similar manner to that of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 7, 9, 12 and 18 are allowable for the same reason given above for independent claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7,

9, 12, and 18, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom, overcome the rejections under 35 USC §102 and are allowable over these rejections.

Claims 2 through 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms, Sr., in view of Dunn. Claims 12 through 15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Helms, Sr., in view of Dunn. It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 10, and 12-15 are allowable for the same reason given above for independent claim 1 and hence are allowable under 35 USC §103(a) for the same reasons. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4, 10, and 12-15 as amended, overcome the rejections under 35 USC §103(a) and are allowable over these rejections.

If Applicant can be of any further assistance or provide any other information in the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (248) 364-2100.

Respectfully submitted,

RAGGIO & DINNIN, P.C.

By: 

Michael T. Raggio (Reg. No. 36,645)  
2701 Cambridge Court, Ste. 410  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326  
(248) 364-2100

*Attorney for Applicant*

Dated: December 12, 2005